UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,240	07/17/2006	Noriko Sugimoto	2006_0986A	1802
	7590 02/03/201 , LIND & PONACK I	EXAMINER		
1030 15th Stree Suite 400 East	*	COPPOLA, JACOB C		
Washington, DC 20005-1503			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3621		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/03/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com eoa@wenderoth.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/586,240	SUGIMOTO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JACOB C. COPPOLA	3621	

	JACOB C. COPPOLA	3621					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 14 January 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (a). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, hay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	of the date of appeal. Since a				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	isideration and/or search (see NOT w); er form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying th					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 2,6 and 7. Claim(s) objected to:	35 USC §112, second paragraph in submitted in a separate, the will not be entered, or b)	ejection of claims 2, 6 imely filed amendmer	5, and 7. It canceling the				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 3-5, and 13</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>8-12 and 14-16</u> . <u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•					
1. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	F 10/30/06) Paper No(s)						
/ANDREW J. FISCHER/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3621	/JACOB C. COPPOLA/ Examiner, Art Unit 3621						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claim 1 remains rejected under 35 USC §103 - applicants arguments are not persuasive. Claim 13 remains rejected because of Yamada's disclosure of a "formation date" recorded on the optical disc which meets the claimed "exception schedule flag." Claims 3-5 remain rejected under 35 USC §112 2nd because, looking at claim 3 for example, the recitation of "the predetermined condition is satisfied when the playback authorization list..." is unclear with respect to the structure of the system. The Examiner recommends amending claim 3 to recite that the control unit is further programmed to determine that "the predetermined condition is satisfied when the playback authorization list...." Such an amendment would alleviate any confusion with respect to the structure of the claimed system. The double patenting rejection is maintained.